



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,671	08/07/2001	Kevin Miller	ORCL 2000-070-01	3662
45591 7590 05/28/2008 ORACLE C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP TWO NORTH MARKET STREET THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113				
EXAMINER BORLINGHAUS, JASON M				
ART UNIT 3693		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 05/28/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,671

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

JASON M. BORLINGHAUS

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No./Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

The examiner for this application has changed. Please indicate Examiner Borlinghaus as the examiner of record in all future correspondences.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alaia et al (US Patent No. 6,199,050).

Regarding Claim 1, Alaia discloses in an electronic commerce exchange, an auction method, system and apparatus for implementing automatic extension of an

auction in response to bidding activity from auction participants, comprising the steps of:
setting an end time for concluding an auction. (see col. 4, lines 12-40);

- receiving bids from remote bidders via a distributed computing network.
(see col. 4, lines 12-65);
- measuring a number of bids received within a predetermined time of the
auction end time. (see col. 4, lines 12-65);
- if the measured number of bids exceeds a threshold number of bids,
extending the duration of the auction automatically and setting a new
auction end time (see col. 4 -8, 14); and
- notifying auction participants of the new auction end time (see col. 4, line
61 - col. 5, line 46; col. 6, lines 30 - 67; col. 7, lines 1-31).

Alaia does not explicitly disclose wherein said threshold number of bids is at least one bid, although Alaia does disclose that one "aspect of flexible overtime is variable overtime triggers" which implies that the overtime trigger could be set at a variety of settings. (see col. 13, lines 53 – 66).

Additionally, Alaia, while discussing reverse auctions, discloses that "[o]vertime was triggered if the price of a new bid submitted within the appropriate interval was lower than the current best bid." (see col. 13, lines 53 - 66). Examiner asserts that Alaia at least suggests that the threshold number of bids is at least one bid.

If only one bid is submitted the auction will close as originally stated. The submission of only one bid for an auction demonstrates little interest in the auction and closure of the auction would seem to be proper. However, if a second bid is submitted,

especially a second bid that is superior to the first bid, then the auction should be extended. The submission of a second bid indicates interest in the auction and the auction should be extended to allow the first bidder a chance to response.

Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Alaia to allow for any threshold number of bids that the inventor desired. *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975).

Regarding Claims 2 - 6, Alaia discloses an auction method further comprising:

- a step of setting a start time of the auction (see col. 4, lines 12-40);
- the threshold number of bids is user defined (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 14, lines 23-59);
- the predetermined time is user defined (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 9, line 25+; col. 14, lines 23-59);
- the duration of the extension from the new auction end time is user defined. (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 14, lines 23-59); and
- the step of extending the duration of the auction a plurality of times where the greater number of bids is received within the predetermined time respectively (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 14, lines 23-59).

Claims 7 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alaia, as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of eBay Help Basics, Frequently Asked Questions on Bidding (hereinafter, eBay).

Regarding Claim 7, Alaia does not disclose a method including a step of setting a minimum bid difference at which a succeeding bid must differ from a preceding bid from the remote bidders.

Ebay discloses a method of setting a minimum bid difference at which a succeeding bid must differ from a preceding bid from the remote bidders, as is well known in auction practice, called bid increments (see pp. 1-4, especially 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the auction method of Alaia to include the bid incrementation of Ebay because such incorporation would have made the auction more user-friendly and efficient.

Regarding Claim 8, Alaia discloses in an electronic commerce exchange, an auction method for implementing dynamic automatic extension of an auction in response to bidding activity from auction participants, comprising the steps of:

- setting a start time and an end time for an auction. (see col. 4, lines 12-40);
- receiving bids from remote bidders via a distributed computing network. (see col. 4, lines 12-65);
- measuring a number of bids received within a predetermined time of the auction end time. (see col. 4, lines 12 – 65);

- if the measured number of bids exceeds the threshold number of bids, extending the duration of the auction automatically and setting a new auction end time. (see col. 4 -8, 14); and
- notifying auction participants of the new end time (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 9, lines 3-41; col. 14, lines 23-59; and as detailed above).

Alaia does not explicitly disclose wherein said threshold number of bids is at least one bid, although Alaia does disclose that one "aspect of flexible overtime is variable overtime triggers" which implies that the overtime trigger could be set at a variety of settings. (see col. 13, lines 53 – 66).

Additionally, Alaia, while discussing reverse auctions, discloses that "[o]vertime was triggered if the price of a new bid submitted within the appropriate interval was lower than the current best bid." (see col. 13, lines 53 - 66). Examiner asserts that Alaia at least suggests that the threshold number of bids is at least one bid.

If only one bid is submitted the auction will close as originally stated. The submission of only one bid for an auction demonstrates little interest in the auction and closure of the auction would seem to be proper. However, if a second bid is submitted, especially a second bid that is superior to the first bid, then the auction should be extended. The submission of a second bid indicates interest in the auction and the auction should be extended to allow the first bidder a chance to response.

Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Alaia to allow for any

threshold number of bids that the inventor desired. *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975).

Alaia does not disclose a method including a step of setting a minimum bid difference at which a succeeding bid must differ from a preceding bid from the remote bidders.

Ebay discloses a method of setting a minimum bid difference at which a succeeding bid must differ from a preceding bid from the remote bidders, as is well known in auction practice, called bid increments (see pp. 1-4, especially 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the auction method of Alaia to include the bid incrementation of Ebay because such incorporation would have made the auction more user-friendly and efficient.

Regarding Claim 9, 13 and 14, Alaia does not explicitly state that the threshold number of bids is altered dynamically after the start time of the auction or during said auction, although Alaia does disclose that "[d]ecision rules can be set dynamically during the course of the bidding event by the bidder." (see col. 9, lines 61 – 65).

Additionally, Alaia discloses that the "auction may be paused by the auction coordinator to correct technical, market and miscellaneous problems that may arise during the course of an auction." (see abstract).

Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Alaia and Ebay to allow for a user to pause and alter system parameters after the start time of the auction, as

suggested by Alaia, allowing for corrections that may be required during the course of an auction.

Regarding Claims 10 - 12, Alaia discloses the auction method wherein:

- the predetermined time is altered dynamically after the start time of the auction (col. 9, lines 3-41);
- the duration of the extension from the new auction end time is altered dynamically after the start time of the auction (col. 9, lines 3-41);
- extending the duration of the auction a plurality of times where the greater number of bids are received within the predetermined time respectively (col. 7, lines 19-31; col. 9, lines 3-41).

Claims 15 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable in view of Brett (US Patent 6,704,713) in view of Alaia.

Regarding Claim 15, Brett discloses a method for automatically extending an auction comprising the steps of:

- setting an end time for concluding an auction. (see col. 13, lines 1 - 45);
- receiving bids from remote bidders via a distributed computing network. (see col. 13, lines 1 - 45);
- measuring a rate at which incoming bids are received. (see col. 13, lines 1 - 45); and

- if the measured rate of incoming bids exceeds a predetermined threshold, automatically extending the duration of the auction and setting a new auction end time. (see col. 13, lines 1 – 45).

Brett does not teach an auction method comprising notifying auction participants of the new auction end time.

Alaia discloses an auction method comprising notifying auction participants of the new auction end time. (see col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-30; col. 9, lines 3-41; col. 14, lines 23-59; and as detailed above).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brett by incorporating the notification feature of Alaia, thereby allowing potential bidders to be aware of the remaining time in the auction.

Regarding Claims 16 – 18, Brett discloses a method wherein:

- measuring said rate at which incoming bids are received during a predetermined time before the end of said auction. (see col. 13, lines 1 – 45); and
- said threshold is set prior to the start of said auction. (see col. 13, lines 1 – 45).

Brett does not teach a method wherein said threshold is dynamically adjustable during said auction.

While, Alaia does not explicitly state that the threshold number of bids is altered dynamically after the start time of the auction or during said auction, although Alaia

does disclose that "[d]ecision rules can be set dynamically during the course of the bidding event by the bidder." (see col. 9, lines 61 – 65).

Additionally, Alaia discloses that the "auction may be paused by the auction coordinator to correct technical, market and miscellaneous problems that may arise during the course of an auction." (see abstract).

Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brett and Alaia to allow for a user to pause and alter system parameters after the start time of the auction, as suggested by Alaia, allowing for corrections that may be required during the course of an auction.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON M. BORLINGHAUS whose telephone number is (571)272-6924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason M Borlinghaus/
Examiner, Art Unit 3693

May 23, 2008